



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,722	11/21/2003	Sam P. Kaipa	SVL920030081	1830
33221	7590	06/02/2006	EXAMINER	
HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP 2099 PENNSYLVANIA AVE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20006				LEROUX, ETIENNE PIERRE
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2161		

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/718,722	KAIPA ET AL.
	Examiner Etienne P. LeRoux	Art Unit 2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2003.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 November 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/2003</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

Claim Status

Claims 1-23 are pending. Claims 1-23 are rejected as detailed below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-23 are rejected because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

To satisfy section 101 requirements, the claim must be for a practical application of the § 101 judicial exception, which in instant application requires the claimed invention to have a practical, tangible and “real-world” application. It is not clear what useful result is obtained from (1) mapping XML schema components to an undisclosed/unknown object, or (2) naming components of a conversion language, or (3) naming XML schema components per the claim elements of claim 1.

Furthermore, claim 1 is merely nonfunctional descriptive material because mapping and naming is not a data structure(s) which imparts functionality when employed as a computer component. Still further, even if it were recorded on some computer-readable medium such that it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium, claim 1 remains nonfunctional because there is no output/result and thus claim 1 is nonstatutory under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 1 recites “uniquely mapping XML schema components with a conversion language.” A skilled artisan would not be able to make and use the invention because the specification does not provide a clear and concise description of (1) the process of mapping and (2) the conversion language. Particularly, the end result of the process of mapping is not given in the specification.

Claim 1 recites “uniquely naming components of the conversion language based on names of the XML schema components.” A skilled artisan would not be able to make and use the invention because the specification does not provide a clear and concise description of the process of basing components of the conversion language on components of the XML schema.

Claims 8 and 16 include language similar to claim 1 and is rejected on the same basis. Claims 2-7, 9-15 and 17-23 are rejected for at least being dependent from a rejected base claim.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites “uniquely mapping XML schema components” and furthermore recites “uniquely naming components of the conversion language based on names of the XML schema components.” The scope of the present invention cannot be determined because it is unclear whether names of the XML schema components are employed in the mapping of XML schema components.

Claims 8 and 16 include language similar to claim 1 and is rejected on the same basis. Claims 2-7, 9-15 and 17-23 are rejected for at least being dependent from a rejected base claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1-5, 9 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by US Pat No 6,569,207 issued to Sundaresan (hereafter Sundaresan), as best examiner is able to ascertain.

Claims 1, 9 and 16:

Sundaresan discloses a. uniquely mapping XML schema components with a conversion language [Beanmaker 112, Fig 1, col 4, lines 30-35] and b. uniquely naming components of the conversion language based on names of the XML schema components [Fig 1, col 4, lines 30-35, col 5, lines 25-35]

Claim 2:

Sundaresan discloses wherein the conversion language is Java, and step a. further comprises (1) mapping each XML schema element and type to a Java component and (2) uniquely identifying each XML schema element and type within a set of all distinct XML schema [col 4, lines 30-35].

Claim 3:

Sundaresan discloses wherein the conversion language is Java, and step b. further comprises, for each different XML schema element and type, generating a unique Java component name [col 4, lines 30-35]

Claim 4:

Sundaresan discloses wherein the step of generating each said unique Java component name comprises generating each name so that each said name substantially adheres to Java naming standards, and so that each said name remains the same in subsequent mappings of XML schema components when an XML schema component label on which said name is based remains the same [col 4, lines 30-35]

Claim 5:

Sundaresan discloses wherein the conversion language is Java; step a. further comprises (1) mapping each XML schema element, type and attribute to a Java component and (2) uniquely identifying each XML schema element, type and attribute within a set of all distinct XML schema; and step b. further comprises, for each different XML schema element, type and attribute name, generating a unique Java component name; and the method further comprises generating a reusable definition object operable in converting information between an XML object associated with the XML schema and a Java object [col 5, lines 25-35]

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5, 8-12, 15-20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pub No 2002/0073091 issued to Jain et al (hereafter Jain), as best examiner is able to ascertain.

Claims 1, 8, 15, 16, 20 and 23:

Jain discloses a. uniquely mapping XML schema components with a conversion language [XML documents are converted, paragraph 28] and b. uniquely naming components of the conversion language based on names of the XML schema components [Java class, paragraph 28]

Claims 2, 9 and 17:

Jain discloses wherein the conversion language is Java, and step a. further comprises (1) mapping each XML schema element and type to a Java component and (2) uniquely identifying each XML schema element and type within a set of all distinct XML schema [paragraph 28].

Claims 3, 10 and 18:

Jain discloses wherein the conversion language is Java, and step b. further comprises, for each different XML schema element and type, generating a unique Java component name [paragraph 28]

Claims 4, 11 and 19 :

Jain discloses wherein the step of generating each said unique Java component name comprises generating each name so that each said name substantially adheres to Java naming standards, and so that each said name remains the same in subsequent mappings of XML schema components when an XML schema component label on which said name is based remains the same [paragraph 28]

Claims 5, 12 and 20:

Jain discloses wherein the conversion language is Java; step a. further comprises (1) mapping each XML schema element, type and attribute to a Java component and (2) uniquely identifying each XML schema element, type and attribute within a set of all distinct XML schema; and step b. further comprises, for each different XML schema element, type and attribute name, generating a unique Java component name; and the method further comprises generating a reusable definition object operable in converting information between an XML object associated with the XML schema and a Java object [paragraph 28]

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2161

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jain in view of Pub no US 2002/0026471 issued to Bent et al (hereafter Bent), as best examiner is able to ascertain.

Claims 6, 13 and 21:

Jain discloses the elements of claims 1 and 5/ 816 and 20 as noted above but does not disclose wherein step b. further comprises at least one of the group of (a) hashing the name of each element having the same name and type as another element to form an element name hash code part of a Java member variable, (b) hashing the name of each attribute having the same name as another attribute to form an attribute name hash code part of a further Java member variable, (c) hashing a QName for each complex type to form a complex type name hash code part of a Java class name, (d) hashing each LongName name to form a LongName hash code part of a truncated Java name, and (e) hashing a concatenated string of all component names of an anonymous complex type component to form an anonymous complex type hash code part of a further Java class name. Bent discloses wherein step b. further comprises at least one of the group of (a) hashing the name of each element having the same name and type as another element to form an element name hash code part of a Java member variable, (b) hashing the name of each attribute having the same name as another attribute to form an attribute name hash code part of a further Java member variable, (c) hashing a QName for each complex type to form a complex type name hash code part of a Java class name, (d) hashing each LongName name to form a LongName hash code part of a truncated Java name, and (e) hashing a concatenated string

of all component names of an anonymous complex type component to form an anonymous complex type hash code part of a further Java class name [paragraph 158]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Jain to include wherein step b. further comprises at least one of the group of (a) hashing the name of each element having the same name and type as another element to form an element name hash code part of a Java member variable, (b) hashing the name of each attribute having the same name as another attribute to form an attribute name hash code part of a further Java member variable, (c) hashing a QName for each complex type to form a complex type name hash code part of a Java class name, (d) hashing each LongName name to form a LongName hash code part of a truncated Java name, and (e) hashing a concatenated string of all component names of an anonymous complex type component to form an anonymous complex type hash code part of a further Java class name as taught by Bent for the purpose of creating a new element tuple [paragraph 158].

Claims 7, 14 and 22:

The combination of Jain and Bent disclose the elements of claims 1, 5 and 6/8/16 and 21 as noted above and furthermore, discloses appending a suffix to a generated Java component name based on a first XML schema component name when the generated Java component name is identical to a previously generated Java component name based on a second XML schema component name different from the first XML schema component name [Jain, paragraph 33]

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Etienne P. LeRoux whose telephone number is (571) 272-4022. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:00 am and 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin can be reached on (571) 272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Etienne LeRoux

5/19/2006

